

David Schoenbrun
New York Times Book Review
Times Square, New York

Dear Mr. Schoenbrun:

Your review of recent books on John Kennedy's foreign policy in the New York New York Times Book Review disappointed me because I had so much regard for your reporting on the tragedy of the Vietnam War, and in this case I feel you have to too large an extent fallen into a trap set for the unwary.

It is indeed true that John Kennedy was as you depict him -- but that appears to me a half truth, and a very misleading one. The extent of the change that was taking place in Kennedy's perspective is not hinted at in your review. I believe that these books you reviewed are at least to some extent planned for and inspired by the public opinion control apparatus of the administration to help make it appear that the Johnson government is in the main line of continuity of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. It is of great political importance to Nixon, as it earlier was to Johnson, to establish this in the public mind. But this is not true. For John Kennedy was deeply in the process of drastic revision and reconsideration of that policy, and the extent of that revision is reflected in the message that he sought to have passed on to the people in the world peace message at the American University. That Castro and Khrushchev recognized the change in process is documented in many places, particularly in Jean Daniel's reporting of his role as unofficial emissary between Kennedy and Castro. I will inclose a copy of a letter I wrote outlining some of the other evidence on this.

I am among the small circle of careful students of the three assassinations of Kennedy and Martin Luther King. I unearthed some of the crucial evidence establishing the means by which the assassination took place through coordination by mobile radio, I established through police testimony that Oswald knew Jack Ruby, and so on. I take seriously the report by Gary Underhill (who had been "limited warfare specialist" and military analyst for Time Magazine, that his life was in danger, for he had found evidence that the far east division of the CIA was involved in the assassination conspiracy. Underhill's subsequent murder from a shot through the left rear of his head (and he was right handed) cannot be ascribed to suicide. Oswald showed no signs of mental disturbance throughout his ordeal--demonstrating sanity. In all eight of the documented instances of Oswald's expression of opinion about Kennedy his opinion had been strongly favorable to Kennedy. He had been working for the CIA on the U2 base in Japan. He had gotten a second passport to Russia (after his original "refection" on twenty-four-hour notice. And both the Texas attorney general and

the United States District Attorney had testified in a secret session of the Warren Commission that their information was that Oswald had been an informer for the CIA ~~and~~ and FBI. The headquarters from which Oswald had distributed his pro-castro leaflets in New Orleans was a CIA-funded anti-castro headquarters. I could go on with such information for hours, well documented. At the heart of all this is the well documented perspective of the conspirators, their bitterest enemy Oswald. They understood that Oswald changed his mind and would not press for military invasion of Cuba or for the JFK line, which he had become so disillusioned with.

If there is any one document that should turn one's thinking, or that should be the topic of the Miami Herald's police report from one of the conspirators before the assassination telling how it would be done, and the document from the archives of the assassination, giving the full and complete report from the informant telling, or hearing, from the conspirator after the assassination, telling from Dallas, saying that it was indeed what was said, and that they made no mistake in their suspects.

Sincerely,

GRISCOM ROSS